
"Problem Papers" now ready are:

"Why Believe in God?".....By Sister Hilary, C.S.M.
"What is God Like?".....By Rev. M. B. Stewart
"How Can I Believe?".....By Prof. W. P. Sears, Jr.
"How Could a Man Be God?".....By Rev. M. B. Stewart
"What About Jesus?".....By Rev. W. N. Pittenger
"Does Your Life Matter?".....By Rev. W. S. Chalmers, O.H.C.
"What is Christian Sociology?".....By Rev. J. F. Fletcher
"What is Meditation?".....By Rev. Mother Mary Theodora, C.S.M.

Some "Problem Papers" in preparation are:

"What is Religion?".....By Prof. H. D. Roelofs
"How Do We Know God?".....By Prof. J. S. Moore
"What is the Relation Between Religion and Science?".....By Prof. O. N. Hillman
"What Did Christ Do for Us?".....By the Rev. M. B. Stewart
"Why the Resurrection?".....By the Very Rev. E. J. M. Nutter
"Why the Church?".....By the Rev. L. C. Lewis
"What is Holiness?".....By the Rev. Angus Dun
"What is Sin?".....By the Rev. E. R. Hardy, Jr.
"Why Suffering?".....By the Rev. B. I. Bell
"Why the Sacraments?".....By the Rev. D. A. McGregor
"What is the Blessed Sacrament?".....By the Rev. W. E. Conkling
"What is Christian Marriage?".....By the Rev. Alfred Newbery
"What is the Relation Between Christianity and Psychology?"

By the Rev. Otis R. Rice

Price, 10 cents each; \$1.00 a dozen; \$7.00 a hundred

Holy Cross Press, West Park, N. Y.

How Could a Man Be God?

Marshall Bowyer Stewart



PROBLEM PAPER, NO. 5
PRICE TEN CENTS

The Reverend Marshall Bowyer
Stewart, D.D., is Professor of
Dogmatic Theology at the General
Theological Seminary,
New York City.

How Could a Man Be God?

THERE are so many senses in which it would be impossible for a man to be God, that you have probably already answered the question in your own mind, in short and simple words, "He couldn't." But the fact remains that Christians generally have thought of a certain Person as a real human being who lived on earth awhile ago, and have also treated Him as God and prayed to Him. They have let the name of this Person *include* a Man and His God. In every other case, Christians speak of a man and his God as two different persons; in this one and only case, the Man and His God are not "they" but "He," one Person. And that is not just an accident, or a little mannerism in Christianity. It is at the heart of the religion itself.

I.

THE HUMANITY OF JESUS CHRIST

THE very essence of religion is that in it God and man come together, and are in some way united; united as spiritual beings may be united,

having some mutual knowledge and regard; not united merely as a potter and his clay, but as mind and mind. In religion man seeks to attain and maintain unity with God, but he finds that God has been beforehand with him, and man's part in religion is thus essentially receptive, welcoming, thankful. Viewed in this way, religion finds its very heart in the Incarnation, for this is a uniquely close union of God and man, God taking the initiative.

Adoration is probably not the only attitude proper to religion. God above us, the Father, source and guardian of all, properly receives adoration. God in us, the Holy Spirit, is God in a different religious relation to us. And God the Son, God Incarnate, is related and united to us in still a different way, as God with us. Religion includes something of comradeship with God, friendship, brotherhood. The reader is referred to Karl Adam's "Christ Our Brother."

Now all the standard accounts that we have of this supreme union of God with us, all the stories about Christ that have come to us put together in the Gospels, purport to be about a real man, datable in history, located in Pales-

tine not a pious fiction or parable or myth, intended to teach a lesson about nature, man, and God in general. But they do not tell us very much in the way of precise biography. Historical science in our own day is chary of affirming many definite events in our Lord's life, and even of quoting many sayings as being literally His own. The Gospels do not appear to be chiefly concerned with chronological detail, or with literal quotation. But one great historical fact is known and admitted, however much else may be doubted—we know that an impression was made on some people which is described for us in the New Testament. As Dr. L. W. Grensted says in "The Person of Christ," "What is certain is that the life of Jesus must have been such as to account for the experience of the Apostolic Church, and in particular for the writing of the New Testament record itself . . . the 'Quest of the Jesus of History' . . . is not primarily a search for sheer fact, unaffected by records and later experiences. In that sense the search must needs be a failure. For though it is indeed true that Christianity rests upon historical facts, these facts are not past and dead. The Jesus of

history is the Jesus who lived and lives in the fellowship of those who love Him."

If the Incarnation were merely a means of teaching us a lesson, saying something to us, showing us what God is like and what we should be like, then it might be unimportant whether any historic Jesus ever lived or not. The "sublime poem of the Christ life" would still teach us much, though even so it would scarcely teach more than what some man thought God was like. A historical myth reveals the mind of the maker of the Universe; an unhistorical myth reveals the mind of the maker of the myth. But if the Incarnation is more than a teaching drama, if it is also a coming into our life, to give us a new way of union with God, or reunion after estrangement, then it is still more important that a real event should have occurred, not only in word, but in Word-made-flesh.

Our Lord gave His friends the impression of unique human perfection and compelling power. He was, in Otto's famous idiom, "numinous" to them. "Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord." We cannot, dare not attempt to, give a character-sketch of our Lord. Yet "sin-

lessness" is such a negative and abstract thing to say! And "perfection" likewise. Who knows just what perfection in a human being is? What is meant is a great superlative of excellence, but it tells little that is concrete. And neither sinlessness nor perfection is a matter of observation, only of inference.

When it does come to the concrete qualities, the real human traits that our Lord showed, probably the best we can do is to read the Gospels, and see Him in action, always remembering the background of loving adoration from which the narrator speaks. The evangelist knows he cannot describe our Lord. Modern popular biographers often make the attempt.

For many people admire Jesus. But not all for the same reason. They do not agree either with the traditional, "stained-glass-window" picture of Him, or with one another, regarding the traits of character which they see and admire in Him. And some see traits that they do not admire. George Moore ("Confessions of a Young Man") dislikes the "pale Galilean." H. G. Wells thinks He "droops." So of course in His earthly life some disapprove of Him more or less. And so

it is nowadays. I don't think we have any reason to suppose that the most truthful description we could give of our Lord would win unqualified admiration for Him. I dare say even among professed Christians in our churches and church schools, some of the truth about our Lord's character (and of course much of the stained-glass-window portraiture) is unwelcome. If our young people were to draw up lists of the things they most admire in a man, and if we were (independently) to draw up lists of the things most characteristic of our Lord, it is not likely that the lists would coincide. Probably many of our church folks do not greatly admire founders and reformers of religion, men who go about preaching and teaching religion. Perhaps we know this beforehand, and so fix up our portraiture of our Lord as to leave out the unpopular features and emphasize those which the present generation likes to see and admire, even to the extent of showing Him to the world in which we live, (oh, quite sincerely) as

"A common-place young man—

A matter-of-fact young man—

A steady and stolidly, jolly Bank-holiday,

Every-day young man."

And many will join with Patience the Dairy-
maid in rejoicing at the transformation.

Likewise consider the pictures of Christ—the Byzantine, the Renaissance, the Baroque, the Hofmann, the Tissot, the Tiffany, the Sunday-school leaflet. . . .

But the truth is, that the character of Jesus "must have been such as to account for the experience of the Apostolic Church, and in particular for the writing of the New Testament record itself." And it comes to this, I think, that to those who knew Him best, Jesus seemed to be an act of God, a gift of God, a presence of God, one with God.

He was, withal (and still is), one with us, "of one substance with us" according to His humanity. Now humanity is finite and creaturely: it has limitations, although we cannot tell just where the limits come in. Just what humanity can do and cannot do, with its own resident forces, we cannot precisely tell; still less can we tell how much or how little humanity can do by the grace of God, without ceasing to be essentially human. But it certainly seems reasonable to hold at least that a human being as such can-

not be the uncreated Creator, and cannot stand in the relations to creation that we call by the names of omnipotence, omnipresence, and omniscience. Far greater limitation than this is generally ascribed to humanity, and the Gospels represent the humanity of Christ as finite in power, in presence (not ubiquitous), and in psychological process. It is the last of these that calls for our attention now.

For from the first there has been a tendency to shirk the limitations in our Lord's humanity. Some in the Church have insisted that He did not have a real human body, or that He did not have a real human mind, or will, or "nature." The main line of the Church's teaching has affirmed that He did (and does) have all these. But often there has been a tendency to ignore almost all the probable limitations of humanity, while still using the name. Divine grace in the humanity of Christ is, some of us would say, without measure: it can do anything with humanity except convert it into absolute, infinite Deity.

In regard to Christ's human knowledge, St. Thomas says that it did not amount to om-

niscience, but was perfect in every kind of knowledge of which a human mind is capable. There was acquired knowledge, learned by experience; and this goes without question. But also our Lord's human mind has "infused knowledge," a gift of grace from His Divinity (i. e., God), by which He (still humanly) knew all things, past, present, and future, which can enter into human minds—and knew them all from the very beginning of His human life. He needed not to be taught anything by anybody, and it was not fitting that He should be taught. And thirdly, His human mind had, from the first, "beatific knowledge," that beatific vision which human saints hope to have in heaven.

Now we in these days find it all too easy to sweep this aside entirely, as impossible, utterly inhuman. But a more considerate judgment, I think, would allow that our Lord's human mind had *some* "infused knowledge," inspiration, illumination, revelation, and at times, no doubt, *some* foretaste of the beatific vision of God. How much, of course, we cannot say; but it is very difficult to allow that such absolute fulness of inspired knowledge was His all the time—even

in His infancy. That would seem indeed utterly beyond the possible limits of human psychology. We cannot say that it was impossible for grace to do so much, but it would require very strong evidence to make it credible that it did so. And there is not sufficient evidence. St. Thomas relies largely on the Aristotelian idea of knowledge of "forms" instead of observation of facts. And he relies largely on what was "fitting"; but we do not know that this would be the most fitting thing for God to do.

On the other side, the more naturalistic side, there has been a rather sudden readiness to say that our Lord's human mind made mistakes, e. g., in regard to Biblical authorship, eschatology, even moral teaching (non-resistance), and His own personal identity (He believed himself to be the Celestial Messiah, and we do not believe such a being ever existed). Well, certainly He seemed to have incomplete knowledge, and the fact did not frustrate the purposes of His mission. His really having incomplete human knowledge likewise is not incompatible with His being God Incarnate. But certainly there is a point beyond which we cannot go in ascribing

incomplete knowledge to Him without rejecting His teaching authority (expertness) altogether, and reducing His prophetic work to such low degree as is involved in "following His teaching at those points at which experience has shown it can be followed by a later and a wiser age" (Gilkey "Meeting the Challenge of Modern Doubt," 183).

We can hardly say or think anything about our Lord in His humanity without implicit reference to the Divine Nature at work there, revealing and giving itself there. For surely, as far as we can see, if ever God has acted in our world, the human life of Jesus was God's act.

II.

THE DEITY OF JESUS CHRIST

ONE fact about the historical Jesus that is most certainly historical fact is the overwhelming impression He made upon His disciples. Whatever in detail He may have said and done, He must have been such a person as to account for the religion of the New Testament, and for the writing of the record itself. He was, as Loofs says, accorded a two-fold judg-

ment and treatment, "according to the flesh" and "according to the spirit," as a man and as somehow pre-existent and divine.

Now this judgment that He was (and is) divine has sometimes been regarded as perfectly clear and unambiguous: you believed it or not, but you were not in any doubt what it meant. After awhile perhaps you detected people believing in His "Divinity" but not His "Deity." In reality, whether people say Divinity or Deity, the range of meanings within which the belief may roam is almost infinite. What chiefly may the "Divinity of Christ" mean?

1. The Divinity of Christ may mean His goodness, His human goodness. That is what it does mean to a vast number of modern Christians, and they will vindicate His Divinity by defending Him from the charge of any sin of which He may be accused. There is a great deal of naïve assumption that perfect humanity is Divinity; and there is a great deal of support for that equation, which is not naïve. It accords well with the idea of God as simply value, goodness, the moral attributes generally. If God has (is) only the moral attributes, then any being that

has moral attributes has Deity; and if anyone acquires them, even late in life, he acquires Deity, rises into Deity, is deified. This reminds one of Canon Quick's great saying: "The Liberal-Protestant . . . tortures his brain in order to find means to predicate Deity of a mere man, with the inevitable result that Deity becomes a mere predicate." That is, God becomes "adjectival" to a man, becomes a name for the sum-total of the good qualities that a man has. And if God means simply the goodness of a man, the perfection of a man, it seems reasonable to hold that God is the goodness or perfection of anything—why man in particular?

2. Or, instead of equating God with the goodness of a man, some (in the Hegelian monist tradition) equate God with human nature as such: perfect humanity is deity; and so Christ is of one substance with the Father, and with us, and we are essentially of one substance with God. This is difficult to deal with because it is so deeply immersed in the philosophy of the Absolute, which is always difficult to deal with. Perhaps as Christians we should say, in its favour, that we agree that humanity (and every-

thing else for that matter), insofar as it attains its characteristic fulness of being, is a work of God, an act of God, an idea of God, an image of God, an experience of God. But on the other hand, we must say (1) that humanity (and every creature) is only a small part of what God makes, does, and experiences; and (2) that humanity is something else besides a work of God, etc.—it is not simply and solely God's doing, but it does some things of its own. A man is an act of God, but not the whole of God's activity (still less the whole of God's being). A man is an act of God, but not wholly of God. To say that Christ is God in the sense that humanity in its perfection is the same as Deity, of course, dissolves the "otherness" of God, so that "we seem to be losing sight of Him or faith in Him altogether as a Being over against, above, transcending all else we know, with whom we can enter into personal relations as with Someone Else" (Quick, 50). The trouble we find with both these theories, that Christ's Divinity means His human goodness, and that it means His whole and perfect humanity, is that their doctrine of God is inadequate to theistic religion.

3. Suppose, then, that we stand firm for the transcendence, otherness, infinitude, of God. There is the possibility that Christ was a man who "had Divinity" in the sense that God was working in Him to a very high degree. The Divinity of Christ may mean the grace of God in Him. For it is basic to our religion to hold that if ever God has acted in this world of ours, Jesus Christ was God's act. This position—the Divinity of Christ means God's grace in Christ—is very familiar to us all as a popular liberal doctrine, and it is favoured in many of the books. It seems to me to be far the strongest rival to the Catholic Christology. For we hold all that it positively holds as true, that God created this human Being, chose Him, worked out His purpose in Him, endowed Him with the fulness of grace, dwelt in Him, guided and guarded Him, to a supreme degree. Here God is fully God, and man is really man—the "two natures" are maintained in their integrity—but the relation between God and man in Christ is, after all, according to this theory in its negations, essentially no other than in the Prophets and other heroes of religion. And we do not pray, or commend our souls, to the

Prophets: but we do pray to Christ and commend our souls to Him.

4. For this, no Christology is sufficient except that which holds that the Divinity of Christ is simply Divinity, the only Divinity there is, Deity, God, and that this Deity is "of Christ" in the sense that in Him God and man are united as one "Person," so that we can say "Thou" to Him in prayer, and can say "He" when discussing His human career and character—and mean the same "Person" in both cases. For this religion, prayer, divine worship, toward Jesus (not just "religion *about* Jesus" or "religion *of* Jesus"), there is preparatory justification in that the Man Christ Jesus was *like* God in many attributes, and adequately *represented* God (Messiah, speaking with authority, bidding men come to Him) without damage to God's own glory and prerogative (the "jealous God," we feel sure, is not jealous of Him). But it is not fully justified until (beginning in the New Testament Church) men have found Christ adequate and satisfying as object of their religion. That adequacy and satisfaction cannot be judged by anything short of religious experience on a large scale and in

great depth. In the long life of the Church there is such justifying experience. And from this experience we say that Christ must be such an one as to account for it. It is not that religious experience justifies Christ, but that Christ justifies Himself through religious experience. It is not that we have deified Him, but that Deity in Him has revealed Himself to us.

There should not be an instant's doubt as to where our Church stands on this matter. The Litany, Te Deum, Gloria in Excelsis, and various collects show that our Church intends to pray to Christ as God. What is done in Churches without a Prayer Book is not so certain: the Protestant hymnology at any rate is full of prayer to Christ; but who would be bound by all the doctrines implied in the Hymnal? Still it is fair to say that it is generally Christian at least sometimes to pray, "O Lord Jesus Christ," . . . If "Jesus" is taken seriously, these words are addressed to a man. If prayer is taken seriously, He is God. And He is addressed thus as one Person. If any people want to eliminate this doctrine of the Deity of Christ, they will have to do more than relegate the Creeds to an appendix of the

Hymnal; they will have to expurgate the prayers.

The statement that "Jesus is God" is true to our religion, as far as it goes: the doctrine is stated in the Nicene Creed and involved in many of our authorized prayers. But many people misunderstand it, and it is not at all a complete formula. It is even possible to make out a case for its being unorthodox, as if it meant strictly that all-there-is of Jesus is identical with all-there-is in God. Something of what is included under our Lord's human name is human, finite, a creature, and not God. Jesus is God and Man. The Person who was given the human name Jesus is the same Person as God the Son -that, I suppose, is what the formula really means. But it would not be quite fair to impose the formula "Jesus is God" as an unambiguous test of orthodoxy.

The same almost inevitable misunderstanding is found in regard to a number of expressions, such as "God died on the cross" (St. Ignatius of Antioch speaks of "the passion of my God"), "God walked this earth," "God's Blood" (cf. the old English "Sblood" and "Zounds" God's

Wounds), and "Mary is the Mother of God" (St. Athanasius and others). In these, "God" is used, not to mean Deity, the Divine nature, all-there-is of God, but to mean the Person Christ, God the Son, God Incarnate. The meaning is that the Person who is God the Son is the same Person as Jesus who was born of Mary, died on the cross, etc. But it seems to mean that the Godhead, Deity, was born, died, etc. Probably the genuine meaning is given if we say, instead of simply "God," "God Incarnate" was born, died, etc. If we do not in some such way say what we really mean, we cause needless confusion in our hearers' minds.

Now as we look upon the various things that can be meant, and are meant, by the Divinity or Deity of Christ, -the Divinity of Christ means either (1) His human goodness, or (2) His complete humanity, or (3) the grace of God in Him, or (4) God, united with the man in Him as one Person, let us be sure not to take these meanings as mutually exclusive. There is a "so far so good" contained in all of them. We who believe the last doctrine to be the nearest we can get to the truth believe also that God, in taking hu-

manity into union with Himself was the cause of (1) His human goodness, (2) His complete humanity, and (3) the grace that was in His humanity. But it seems to us that we cannot stop short of the belief that finds Christ worshipful and God companionable, because Christ is God and Man.

No Christology can be adequate to the data of Christian experience which does not take account of God and God's union with a human being in the Person of Christ. Catholic Christianity made these basic affirmations before it began to write systematic theology, and it makes them still: that Christ is (in Dean Matthew's words) — (1) "the completely adequate revelation of the nature of God, (2) Himself one with God, (3) the response of the Eternal to the world's need, and (4) worthy of the uttermost service and adoration, the rightful Lord of the Universe."

III.

THE PERSON OF JESUS CHRIST

WE have treated of the humanity and the Deity of Christ separately (though they are not really separate); all the while, however, each one of these terms called for reference to the other. Now, without blurring the differences between God and man as they exist even in Christ, we mean to consider a few of the most important points in regard to the union of God and man in Christ. For in our belief, Christ is the supreme union of God and man.

Whether we are speaking of Christ or not, we believe that God and man are analogous to each other, but not identical, alike in some respects but unlike in others. Even perfect humanity is created, not the Creator; it is finite, dependent, local, temporal, limited in knowledge and power; and God is very different from all this. But even imperfect humanity is real, active, living, knowing, loving, personal; and God is, we believe, something like all this. Generally speaking, God and man are most unlike in their cosmic character; they are most alike

(though far from identical) in their moral character. And the contrast and the similarity both hold true of the divine nature and the human nature of Christ, if He is truly God and completely man. Sometimes the "two-natures doctrine" is expressed (for purposes of repudiation) as a belief that Christ "had" a human nature and "a divine nature," as if there were a good many divine natures and Christ had one of them. But if we mean, as the Church means, that "His" divine nature is simply "the" divine nature, that includes the divine infinite, omnipotent, omnipresent, omniscient creatorship, as well as the divine love, kindness, self-sacrifice, etc. It includes those attributes in which God is vastly different from man, as well as those in which the resemblance lies.

If God is not the Creator, but is simply the goodness and beauty of the world, if He has not the cosmic character we attribute to Him as First Cause or Ultimate Reality or World-Ground or Fulness of Being, but has only the moral attributes, if He is only an Ideal, then Incarnation might mean a very different and

easier thing. For people often speak of incarnations metaphorically: often they say that somebody is "the very incarnation of" some quality, he is the very incarnation of unselfishness, or rectitude, or bohemianism, or Victorianism, or the spirit of sacrifice, or Absolute Value. Thus an "incarnation" of quality or virtue (or vice) would mean a particular instance of that quality, or an individual who had that quality. And thus Christ would be an "incarnation" of unselfish love, since He was a man that had unselfish love. We have seen some writing along this line by Christians, yea, Episcopalians! But the main line of Christian belief has found it impossible to appraise Christ merely as an incarnation (a case or example) of a quality or some qualities of God: the Incarnation means to us the union of God (all there is of God) and man.

The "otherness" of God and man goes along with a "togetherness" of God and man. And there are, we believe, several modes of togetherness, or union, between God and man. First by way of creation: every creature is united with its Creator, every stick and stone, every animal,

every man, is united with God in that God is with it and in it to sustain it in existence. Then if the creature has intelligence, he may be united with God also by way of thought and knowledge—union of knower and known. If the creature has moral will, he may be united with God also by way of voluntary service. If he is also “spiritual,” he may be united with God also by way of religious communion, perhaps even the mystical union in which he is no longer conscious of himself as a separate person but forgets personal distinctions in oneness with God. All these modes of union were present in Christ, though not in Christ only. The highest mode of union belongs to Christ alone (so far as we can tell), union by way of person, or one-person union.

But that word “person”! And “personality”! The word “nature” does not give much trouble: the nature of anything is what it is in terms of what it does, its characteristic functions. And in Christ God is “functioning” (divine nature), and so is man (human nature). But “person” is a term that has always put a strain on even the best intentions of minds who wish to communicate their ideas. And yet it seems inevitable, or

at least some word is needed to denote what it denotes in theology. The world we know is made up of portions of stuff, units of stuff, unified bits of stuff, or knots of energy, systems of energy, etc. That is, it consists of individuals, such as atoms, molecules, organisms. Some individuals have intelligence, others do not. Individuals that have reason are called “persons.” So it takes two things to make a “person”: individual unity and rationality. We always give personal names to some animals, because we know that each one of them is an individual unity, and we see something like reason in them. But strictly the only persons we know by observation are human persons. Above the human level we do not know so well; but it seems rash to deny that there may be other beings possessed of unity and intellect, and so personal. And if God has unity and intellect we should call Him personal, too—especially if His unity and His intellect are perfect, instead of imperfect as ours are. If God the Son, within the total unity of the Godhead, has unity and intellect, He is a person, in this broader sense which includes human and super-human persons.

Human persons regularly are unities with experiences on different levels. Every human person functions on the level of physics and chemistry, and also on the level of organic life, and also on the level of mind, and perhaps we should think of spiritual functioning as a still higher level. Living on these different levels, a person unites them into a fairly close-knit system of experience. In this unity, the lower levels are (or should be) made to serve the values of the higher.

When we think of Christ as a Person, we should think of Him likewise as a unity of experiences on different levels, as we are, but also living on the level of divine experience, as we are not. In Him God takes all the human levels of functioning into union with the level of Deity. And in so doing He makes the lower levels serve the values of the highest, of Deity.

Surely, when Christ was visible upon earth, the universe went on by the power of God (His divine nature) as always. And also Jesus lived His temporal, local, human life. There is the difference of the natures. When our Lord (hu-

manly) was asleep in the boat, His Divinity, i. e. God, was ruling and sustaining the world, as always. When He awoke and spoke the human word, His Divinity, i. e. God, calmed the storm. But there was unity of the divine and human, in something analogous to the personal unity of a man, with his different levels of functioning.

Did the divine and human natures in Christ, then, "take turns," did they operate alternately? No, we cannot treat that idea as any better than a parody of the Incarnation. Both natures operated all the time, in their different ways. Or rather we should say that the human operated all the time, and the divine was (is) eternal, above the mere successions of time.

Did the divine and human natures operate on parallel lines, insulated from each other? Surely not; the Gospel tells us of mutual interaction between them: the Deity (God) acted upon the humanity with sustaining power and with grace; the humanity (as our humanity) acted toward the Deity in faith, trust, prayer, and all else that we mean when we speak of the religion of Jesus.

If only we can take the Deity of Christ seri-

ously, take it to mean God, and nothing less, we shall be spared many unnecessary puzzlements. We sometimes speak of "a man and his God": that is a good starting-point for Christology, for we believe Christ to be in a very real sense "a man and his God," only so closely knit together in one that we call the man and his God one "Person." We believe that of Him, and we pray thus to Him, with His human face as it were before our eyes, and prayer going to Him as God. Long ago men found that often, when they were going to pray to God, Christ "got in the way"—and it seemed right and proper that He should, for He helped the prayer instead of interrupting it. They found themselves praying to Christ, and it was all the better when they did.

The same Person, Christ, adores God and is adored as God. That is a paradoxical religious phenomenon, and it is perhaps the chief fact of the Christian religion. It carries with it not only the richness of devotional life that belongs to Christianity, but a quite distinct view of the universe in which we live. The union of God and man in Christ is the great climax in a whole world-full of unions of God and His creatures.

The First Principle of all things, while He is infinitely different from them, yet makes their experience His experience. This world is "full of a number of things," and great are the uses of diversity, as well as adversity, and things happily don't all blur into one, but are united in their diversity. "Incarnationalism," the principle of the unity of the manifold, when the many are on very different levels of being, seems to us the very key to the redemption of all pleasure in variety, all harmony, all mutual love and the sharing and the common holding of all that is dear to us.

SUGGESTED BOOKS

There are innumerable books that give the regular, proper, correct, Christian doctrine of the Incarnation. But I am suggesting the following more recent treatments: Hall, *Incarnation*; Strong, *Incarnation of God*; Bouquet, *Jesus*. For the history of the doctrine, MacArthur's *Chalcedon* is brief and good. For the philosophy of it, Thornton's *Incarnate Lord* is great, but if you cannot stand the bulk and weight of it, Micklem's *Values of the Incarnation* will be good. Paul Elmer More's *Christ the Word* is brilliant, but with dark spots. Quick's *Liberalism, Modernism, and Tradition* is one that I rate most *Person of Christ* is on the whole illuminating, loyal, and highly, to meet the Modernist contentions. Grensted's devout,—a splendid book. I don't agree with all of these, in all points; but I think they are most helpful.